

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-11 have been amended. Claims 6 and 8 have been canceled. Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-11 are now pending. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action states that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on 6/26/2006 is not in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Applicants believe that this statement may have been made by mistake, as the Office Action provides no reasons for the statement, and the Examiner appears to have reviewed and initialed the IDS form. Applicants respectfully request clarification and/or correction regarding the statement of non-compliance.

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure for including reference symbols (e.g., 103C, 101B, etc.). Applicants have amended the abstract of the disclosure to remove the reference symbols. Accordingly, the objection to the abstract of the disclosure should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objected to claims 1-11 for including reference symbols (e.g., 103C, 101B, etc.). Applicants have amended claims 1-11 to remove the reference symbols. Accordingly, the objection to claims 1-11 should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, based on the alleged indefiniteness of the terms “registering means” and “receiving means”. Claim 1, as currently amended, no longer recites “registering means” or “receiving means”. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 112 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) based on Kaji, U.S. Patent No. 5,907,821, in view of D’Agostini, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0040900, and further in view of Brown, U.S. Patent No. 5,805,832. The amended claims overcome these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The claimed subject matter is directed to translation support technologies comprising various elements in combination. Representative claim 1, for example, is directed to a translation

support system capable of assisting in translation and proofreading performed at translation and proofreading terminals. Claim 1, as currently amended, recites a combination including “a draft-translation outputting section for outputting, to [a] translator terminal, draft-translation information including text elements..., draft translations of said text elements..., and an indication, for each text element, of whether or not the text element requires translation and proofreading”. The cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a similar combination.

The Examiner concedes that Kaji fails to disclose draft translations, but relies on Brown to cure this defect. In particular, the Examiner has asserted, in the rejection of claim 6, that Brown’s sentence alignments constitute draft translations. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with this assertion, Applicants respectfully note that Brown’s sentence alignments are not output to a translator terminal as claimed. In particular, Brown fails to disclose outputting the sentence alignments to a translator terminal, together with an indication, for each text element, of whether or not the text element requires translation or proofreading. Because Brown fails to disclose this feature, Brown fails to cure the defects in Kaji, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner asserts that Brown’s alignment scores constitute indications of whether translation and proofreading is necessary for the Brown’s sentence alignments; however, the Examiner presents no evidence that Brown outputs the alignment scores to a translator terminal, or that the alignment scores provide an indication of whether translation and proofreading are required. Applicants believe that the Examiner might be assuming that a translator is able to discern, by accessing and analyzing Brown’s alignment scores, whether translation and proofreading are required. However, absent further evidence, such an assumption would be no more than an unsubstantiated conjecture motivated by hindsight.

As discussed in Applicants’ specification, by outputting, to a translation terminal, draft translations and indications of whether translation and proofreading are required, embodiments of the claimed subject matter allow translators and proofreaders to more efficiently process text elements. For instance, the indications may allow human translators and proofreaders to quickly identify a current stage of translation and proofreading for a particular text element in order to speed

up the processes of manual translation and/or proofreading. (See, e.g., the subject specification at paragraph [0079].) None of the cited references teaches or suggests the claimed combinations for achieving such a benefit. Accordingly, the claimed subject matter represents a non-obvious advance over the cited references.

Claim 1, as currently amended, further recites a combination including “a translation outputting section for outputting, to said proofreader terminal, translation information including the text elements and the translations saved in said third memory, wherein said translations are indicated as being subjects for proofreading”. The cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose a similar combination.

The Examiner asserts that D’Agostini discloses outputting a translation to an operator terminal for proofreading. (See Office Action, p. 8, citing D’Agostini at [0192].) The cited disclosure in D’Agostini, however, merely discusses a single terminal for reviewing automatically translated text. In other words, D’Agostini does not disclose a combination including a separate translator terminal and proofreader terminal, or the use of indications to distinguish texts that require translation or proofreading or both. Accordingly, D’Agostini fails to appreciate the efficiency benefits that can be achieved by dividing translation and proofreading into separate tasks. In view of D’Agostini’s failure to disclose a combination including translation and proofreading terminals as claimed, coupled with a similar failure by the other cited references, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 is directed to a computer readable medium storing a translation support program including a combination of features similar to those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn for reasons similar to those discussed above in relation to claim 1.

Claim 2-5, 7, and 9-10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable based at least on their respective dependences.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 116692008200.

Dated: July 1, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Alex Chartove
Alex Chartove
Registration No.: 31,942
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7744